

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 10, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-21 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4-10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sari et al in view of Lau and Sheynblat is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of original claim 2. Thus, claim 2 recites a vehicle-mounted location unit and a portable fob wherein fob location data is transmitted from a second local data transceiver in the fob to a first local data transceiver in the vehicle-mounted unit, wherein the vehicle-mounted location unit determines a bearing in response to fob location data and vehicle location data, and wherein a bearing is transmitted from the first local data transceiver to the second local data transceiver.

The proposed combination of references fails to obviate claim 1 for the following reasons. Sari et al stores waypoint information in a portable unit so that, upon user request, a distance and direction back to the waypoint can be displayed. A waypoint derived by a vehicle-mounted GPS receiver is automatically transferred to the portable unit upon the occurrence of a triggering event (when the vehicle is parked or shut off). When the triggering event occurs, the portable unit is in the immediate vicinity of the vehicle. Therefore, the relatively short communication range between the portable unit and the vehicle associated with the keyless entry system is sufficient to transfer the waypoint data. During use to obtain directions back to the vehicle, however, the portable unit would normally be out of range of the vehicle unit (e.g., at a campsite with the vehicle parked at a trailhead). Consequently, it would generally not be possible to provide aiding data to the portable unit in Sari et al. In contrast, claim 1 always requires the portable fob to be within range of the vehicle-mounted unit because fob location data is transmitted from the fob to the vehicle and then a bearing is transmitted back from the vehicle to the fob.

Lau likewise fails to either teach or suggest the transmission of any location data from a portable unit back to a base station (e.g., vehicle) so that a base station determines a bearing to be transmitted back to the portable unit. In fact, the location of the base station in Lau is irrelevant since there are no waypoints and no attempt to provide a bearing between two GPS-determined locations. The GPS base station can even be as much as three thousand miles from the GPS receiver (col. 4, lines 13-19).

Sheynblat is similar to Lau in that there are no waypoints or other means of obtaining a bearing between the aided GPS receiver and any other location. Therefore, claims 1 and 4-10 are allowable over Sari et al in view of Lau and Sheynblat.

Even considering the additional references of Ayed or Brust et al, claims 1 and 4-10 are still allowable. Ayed includes only one GPS receiver, so it would not be possible to either transfer aiding data on the one hand or to transfer fob location data in order for a vehicle unit to determine a bearing and then transfer the bearing back to the fob on the other hand. Brust merely provides a vehicle waypoint to a portable unit at the time that the vehicle is parked. When retrieving the information to find the way to return to the vehicle, “it does not matter whether or not radio communication with the vehicle is possible” (column 2, lines 17-19). Once again, it would not be generally possible to transmit fob location data to the vehicle in order for the vehicle to determine a bearing and provide the bearing information to the fob. Therefore, claims 1 and 4-10 should be allowed.

The rejection of claims 3 and 11-20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sari et al in view of Lau and Sheynblat and further in view of Ayed or Brust is respectfully traversed. As noted above, the combined references neither teach or suggest transmitting predetermined aiding data to a portable fob, the portable fob processing fob location data in response to the aiding data, transmitting the fob location data to a vehicle-mounted location unit, the vehicle-mounted location unit determining bearing information in response to a vehicle location and the fob location data, and then transmitting bearing information from the vehicle-mounted location unit to the portable fob. The invention recited in claims 3 and 11-20 reduces processing

requirements in the portable fob over what was required in the prior art and over what would result from combining the cited references.

New claim 21 recites that the fob location data comprises pseudo-range data and that the vehicle-mounted location unit determines a portable fob location in response to the pseudo-range data. None of the cited reference, alone or in combination, provide any teaching or suggestion of sending pseudo-range data to the vehicle so that the vehicle performs both the final determination of the fob coordinates and the determination of a bearing from the fob to the vehicle. Therefore, claim 21 is likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1 and 3-21 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: October 7, 2005
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)